



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,138	11/16/2001	Jared L. Zerbe	RBS2.P043	6177
30554 7590 05/13/2008 SHEMWELL MAHAMED I LLP 4880 STEVENS CREEK BOULEVARD SUITE 201 SAN JOSE, CA 95129				
EXAMINER JAMAL, ALEXANDER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,138

Applicant(s)

ZERBE, JARED L.

Examiner

ALEXANDER JAMAL

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Based upon the submitted amendment, the examiner notes that claims 1-

3,5,7,8,12,13,15,17,18,19,32,40,41 have been amended and claims 44,45 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al [US 20030002474 A1] in view of Franaszek et al [US 4,486,739].

Regarding claim 1, Alexander et al teach a method comprising:

communicating the signal over a plurality of segments of at least four signal lines [Fig. 2; Para: 0034-0041]; and transposing the signal lines between the segments of signal lines in a manner that reduces differences in interline couplings between a given signal line and each of the remaining ones of the at least four signal lines [Figs. 8A-8F; Para: 0101-0121].

Alexander et al do not teach expressly using encoding a digital signal for transmission and specifically disclosing a specific set of four signal lines with alternating segment positions.

Franaszek et al teach an encoder circuit for encoding a digital signal [Figs. 1-13; col. 4, line 30 to col. 6, line 36]. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Franaszek et al with Alexander et al in order to incorporate encoded digital signals so that the data throughput of a communication system is increased [Franaszek et al; col. 1, lines 7-22].

Furthermore, the examiner contends that one of ordinary skill in the art would know to experiment and arrange the segments so to minimize crosstalk. It is obvious to vary the positions of the traces so to minimize crosstalk, or to have one interpair crosstalk to cancel another interpair crosstalk in order to minimize crosstalk for a particular application.

3. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelkunoff [US 2,038,240] in view of Franaszek et al [US 4,486,739].

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 1, Schelkunoff teaches a method comprising: communicating the signal over a plurality of segments of at least two signal lines [Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 51-58]; and transposing the signal lines between the segments of signal lines in a manner that reduces differences in interline couplings between a given signal line and another signal line [Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 38-72; claim 5].

Schelkunoff et al do not teach expressly using encoding a digital signal for transmission.

Franaszek et al teach an encoder circuit for encoding a digital signal [Figs. 1-13; col. 4, line 30 to col. 6, line 36].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Franaszek et al with Schelkunoff in order to incorporate encoded digital signals so that the data throughput of a communication system is increased [Frasaszek et al; col. 1, lines 7-22]. Further, although Schelkunoff teaches reducing cross-talk between a plurality of coaxial conductor lines using a pair of lines as an illustration [Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 39-57], it is within the level of ordinary skill to apply the method to reduce interline couplings between a given signal line and any number of remaining conductor lines including at least four signal lines and specifically disclosing a specific set of four signal lines with alternating segment positions.

Furthermore, the examiner contends that one of ordinary skill in the art would know to experiment and arrange the segments so to minimize crosstalk. It is obvious to vary the positions of the traces so to minimize crosstalk, or to have one interpair crosstalk to cancel another interpair crosstalk in order to minimize crosstalk for a particular application.

Regarding claim 2, Schelkunoff further teaches the method, wherein the interline coupling of a particular pair of signal lines is represented as a function of the distances between the particular pair of signal lines over all the segments [col. 4, 45-50].

Regarding claim 3, Schelkunoff further teaches the method, wherein the interline coupling of a particular pair of signal lines is represented as a function of a summation of the distances between the particular pair of signal lines over all the segments, wherein the summation of distances is not shown [Fig. 2].

Regarding claim 4, Schelkunoff further teaches the method, wherein, in general, the segments may be of different (or approximately equal) lengths [Col. 3, lines 45-50].

Regarding claims 5-7, the limitations are shown above.

Regarding claims 8-45, they are inherent variations of the method claims 1-7. Therefore claims 8-43 are interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons stated above in claims 1-7.

As per **claims 15,18,19,33,34,36,37,42,43**, the examiner contends it would have been obvious to manipulate various wire positions (as done by both Schelkunoff and Alexander) in terms of the interwire crosstalk (crosscoupling) as that is the primary term which all the prior art is set to minimize.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner additionally notes that the entire concept of positioning wires to avoid/cancel has been used for a very long time. The entire concept of twisted wired pairs is to physically position the wires to avoid or reduce interference. Examiner contends it would have been obvious to apply those basic concepts to any situation where information is being transferred over conductive (radiating) media.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
(i) Nyquist [US 2,070,744] teaches crosstalk reduction in communication systems [Whole document]; and
(ii) Balde [US 3,764,727] teaches transposing each wire in the pair [Figs. 1-15; col. 1, lines 19-38].
(iii) Hinderks [US 6,700,958 B2] teach a method for transmitting coded digital signals through a transmission channel [Figs. 1, 12-13, 16-17; Abstract].

The examiner further notes prior art patent to Hashim et al. (6464541) which also teaches the concepts of positioning conductive lines to minimize crosstalk.

I. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and **571-273-8300** for After Final communications.

/Alexander Jamal/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Examiner Alexander Jamal

May 13, 2008